

VZCZCXYZ0009
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #1241/01 1712043
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 202043Z JUN 06
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9383

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 001241

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [AORC](#) [KUNR](#) [UNGA](#)
SUBJECT: GA MANDATE REVIEW DISCUSSIONS

¶1. Summary: General Assembly mandate review discussions continued in light of the Co-Chairs proposal to focus remaining discussion, at least initially, on those mandates that are older than five years and have not been renewed. Co-Chair Rock opened the meeting by addressing the Co-Chairs letter, dated June 9th, stating that the informal plenary would consider mandates older than five years and non-renewed as well as "identify other possible areas where there could be agreement." There is a clear division among those states that want to review all mandates and those that want to vastly limit the scope and duration of the review. There was intense resistance from NAM and G-77 (Algeria and Cuba) to consideration of mandate review that went beyond a review of Mandates older than five years and had not been renewed. Japan and the U.S (see para.2) expressed disappointment with the Co-Chairs decision to go forward with a phase one review that focused on seven percent of mandates and questioned whether this would yield tangible reforms and a value-neutral review. Australia, speaking on behalf of CANZ, and Korea stressed that all mandates should be included in this phase of the review and called for a timeline or road-map to continue the review beyond June. The EU, while noting that mandate review should cover mandates older than five years and renewed, suggested that "in the spirit of compromise" the group begin work on the seven percent in the first phase, then widen the scope of the review during the second phase. The UK, while endorsing this position, generally did not suggest limiting review to mandates older than five years that have not been renewed. Co-chair Rock noted the differences among delegations in respect to the issue of mandate review, but pleaded with the group that "we can do nothing or we can do something-the international community is watching". The lively and sometimes divisive meeting was closed by Co-Chair Akram who stated his belief that we need to focus on substance and that Members should bring concrete proposals to the table at the next meeting. Interestingly, he did not refer to mandates older than five years and not renewed as the sole focus of the next discussion.

¶2. Amb. Mark D. Wallace gave a forceful statement questioning any proposal to limit the review, referencing specific language in the Outcome Document that does not limit the review to only those mandates older than five years and not renewed. He engaged in an interactive dialogue with Co-Chairs Rock and Akram.

-Co-Chair Rock noted that there are two interpretations of the Outcome Document and that we have to start somewhere.

-Amb. Wallace responded that reviewing only seven percent of the mandates makes it impossible to conduct a "value-neutral review" and by following that course the GA will do a disservice to the Outcome Document and to the international community as a whole; to which Co-Chair Rock responded by suggesting the U.S intervene during the course of work to highlight exactly when values are being undermined.

-Co-Chair Akram noted that other states should consider the

U.S. remarks and if mandate review was going to be a contentious and relatively fruitless exercise, the GA should "not waste anyone's time." He added that this problem stems from the Outcome Document, where States were "deliberately ambiguous for the sake of consensus" and that the Co-Chair's were trying their best to bridge fundamental differences to at least capture some area of compromise.

-Co-Chair Rock urged the GA to continue, to go beyond process and get into substance so that progress can be made.

13. G-77 and NAM Comments: South Africa (G-77 and China) stressed they are prepared to review each mandate one-by-one, on individual merit so long as the mandates are older than five years and non-renewed. They also expressed their desire to have an assessment by the Secretariat on the status of implementation of each mandate, although this would require additional funding.

-Cuba remarked that the group needs to decide on a clear definition of procedure for the review and was adamant that mandate review applies only to those mandates that are older than five years and not renewed. They also stressed that the deadline for review of mandates was not July 1st, but Dec. 31 2006, and not one day more. Cuba also claimed that any discussion stemming from the addendum relating to Consolidation of Reports that were attached to the last report of the Co-Chair, is invalid; they will oppose consolidation of any kind e.g. reporting, UN bodies etc.

-Algeria, speaking on behalf of NAM, agreed with Cuba that it was essential to develop a methodology for review of mandates and that the mandate review is limited in scope and must end at the conclusion of 2006.

-The Philippines, while agreeing with the position of the

G-77, was less confrontational in tone and suggested that an examination of the seven percent begin immediately. They also suggested that the Co-Chairs consider dividing the seven percent of mandates to be examined into separate groups.

14. Other Comments: Korea welcomed the proposal of the co-chairs to move the process forward, but warned the group that Member States will be short-changed if only seven percent of mandates are considered for review. The Koreans urged the GA to be more ambitious and stated that although we need to start somewhere (with the seven percent), we not limit our review at this phase to the seven percent and that the GA develop a road-map for the second phase.

-Australia for the CANZ similarly asserted that the review should consider all mandates. and that there should be a road-map in place by the end of June with a list of mandates for examination that extends well beyond the seven percent. With respect to this share, CANZ called for the GA to adopt a resolution by the end of the month that will reduce or eliminate mandates.

-Japan expressed surprise and disappointment with the decision to focus discussion on only seven percent of the mandates. It is their view that a review of only seven percent, or 382 of the mandates, "does not look to us as promising areas for any meaningful reform". Japan noted that so-called "politically-sensitive mandates" are also included in the seven percent. Referring to the earlier briefing by Robert Orr they maintained that the informal Plenary should avoid "looking foolish" by reviewing foundation mandates of organs like UNICEF and UNDP.

-Austria (EU) and the UK noted that mandate review should cover mandates older than five years and renewed, but supported proposals to begin with the seven percent.

15. Conclusion and Next Steps: Co-Chair Akram requested that delegations try to keep their differences in abeyance and focus on the process. He asked for Members to bring concrete proposals to the next meeting so that the group can begin

actual work on reviewing mandates. He did not specify however, whether these concrete proposals should focus solely on mandates older than five years and not renewed.

BOLTON